



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,717	11/30/2000	Dale W. Malik	BS00-168	1249
38823 7590 03/30/2007 THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP/ BELLSOUTH I.P. CORP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY SUITE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339			EXAMINER VU, THONG H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/30/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/725,717

Applicant(s)

MALIK, DALE W.

Examiner

Thong H. Vu

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-21 and 23-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2,4-21,23-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Claims 1,2,4-21,23-28 are pending.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-14, filed 2/05/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-2,4-21,23-28 under Progrebisky have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Progrebisky-Ortega.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,4-21,23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Progrebisky et al [Progrebisky 5,958,008] in view of Ortega et al [Ortega 6,853,993 B2].

3. As per claim 1, Progrebisky-Ortega disclose a method of providing a system for automatically checking for an incorrect e-mail address in an outgoing e-mail communication [Progrebisky, A web site analysis program including mail message, col 8 line 47], comprising:

creating an incoming domain name list in a memory [Progrebisky, creates a graphical site map showing all of the URLs, col 7 lines 55];

Art Unit: 2616

receiving an incoming email communication [Progrebisky, incoming link, col 12 lines 12-33];

extracting a domain name from a sender's email address from the incoming email communications [Progrebisky, filter out URLs, col 16 lines 8-26; extract link, col 20 lines 42-59];

storing the domain name in the incoming domain name list in the a memory [Progrebisky, automatically lists all of URLs, col 30 lines 57-67, Fig 22];

checking if a domain name of the e-mail address associated with an intended recipient of the outgoing e-mail communication is included in the incoming domain name list in the memory [Progrebisky, check boxes for URLs and links, col 30 lines 18-31, Fig 30]; and

transmitting the outgoing email communication if the domain name is included in the incoming domain name list, (OR) otherwise generating a prompt for a user to confirm an e-mail address associated with the intended recipient of the outgoing e-mail communication [Progrebisky, scanning URLs address. Otherwise the user is prompted to manually enter the URL, col 20 lines 34-41].

However Progrebisky does not explicitly detail

checking if a discrepancy exists between a domain name of an e-mail address associated with an intended recipient of an outgoing e-mail communication and a domain name included in the incoming domain name list in the memory by detecting when there is at least one but no more than a maximum number of discrepancies

Art Unit: 2616

between a domain name in the domain name database and the extracted domain name;

In the same endeavor, Ortega discloses a system and method for predicting correcting spellings of term or domain name in search queries including a database server [Ortega, Fig 1] automatically replacing the misspelled term with the additional term if the additional is similar in spelling to the potentially-misspelled term to within a defined threshold or no more than a maximum number of discrepancies [Ortega, col 12 lines 60-65]

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the automatically spelling check program with a defined threshold of discrepancies for the replaced misspelled term as taught by Ortega into Progrebisky's apparatus in order to utilize the error code, scanning and prompting process.

Doing so would improve the integrity and accuracy of email message.

4. As per claim 2, Progrebisky-Ortega disclose extracting a domain name from each e-mail address provided in the outgoing e-mail communication, wherein the e-mail communication is transmitted after checking each extracted domain name in the list of domain names, [Progrebisky, scanning URLs address. Otherwise the user is prompted to manually enter the URL, col 20 lines 34-41] and confirming each e-mail address for which the extracted domain name is not included in the incoming domain name list [Progrebisky, verify or confirm external links, col 21 lines 18-24].

5. As per claim 4, Progrebisky-Ortega disclose receiving a corrected e-mail address from the user in response to the prompt; and repeating the steps of checking a corrected domain name and generating a prompt if the corrected domain name is not included in the incoming domain name list, until the user either confirms that the domain name provided in the e-mail address is correct or provides a domain name that is in the list of domain names [Progrebisky, scanning URLs address. Otherwise the user is prompted to manually enter or confirm the URL, col 20 lines 34-41; verify or confirm external links, col 21 lines 18-24].

6. As per claim 5, Progrebisky-Ortega disclose the outgoing e-mail communication is intercepted in an e-mail server to check the domain name in the e-mail address prior to transmission [Progrebisky, filter bar, col 16 lines 8-26].

7. As per claim 6, Progrebisky-Ortega disclose the prompt is an e-mail message from the e-mail server to the user [Progrebisky, prompt, col 20 lines 34-41, mail message, col 8 line 47].

8. As per claim 7, Progrebisky-Ortega disclose the prompt is a network message to the user [Progrebisky, prompt, col 20 lines 34-41].

9. As per claims 21,23-25 contain the similar limitations as set forth in claims 1-2,4-7. Therefore claims 21,23-25 are rejected by the same rationale set forth claims 1-2,4-7.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-20 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Progrebisky et al [Progrebisky 5,958,008] in view of Ortega et al [Ortega 6,853,993 B2] and further in view of Gross et al [Gross 6,782,510B1].

10. As per claim 8 Progrebisky-Ortega disclose A method of automatically checking for misspelled e-mail addresses in outgoing e-mail communications prior to transmission by an e-mail communications server, comprising:

receiving email communications incoming to the email communications server [Progrebisky, web server, Fig 7];

creating a domain name database [Progrebisky, web site database, col 5 line 66];

extracting domain names in senders' e-mail addresses from the e-mail communications incoming to the email communications server [Progrebisky, scanning URLs address, col 20 lines 34-41];

Art Unit: 2616

storing extracted domain names in the domain name database [Progrebisky, creates a graphical site map showing all of the URLs, col 7 lines 55];

receiving outgoing e-mail communications from client computers connected to the e-mail communications server through a local network [Progrebisky, Internet, Intranet, Fig 7];

searching the domain name database for domain names spelled similarly to the domain names in e-mail addresses associated with intended recipients of the outgoing e-mail communication routed in the outgoing e-mail communications [Progrebisky, database search for domain or URLs, col 25 lines 30-45];

by detecting when there is at least one but no more than a maximum number of discrepancies between a domain name in the domain name database and the extracted domain name [Ortega, col 12 lines 60-65, Fig 1];

Progrebisky-Ortega also taught the server returns an error code when the URL is not found [Progrebisky, col 22 lines 19-34, Fig 10]. However Progrebisky-Ortega does not explicitly detail

*generating an error prompt upon detecting that a domain name in an e-mail address provided in an outgoing e-mail communication is misspelled.*

Gross taught an email program [Gross, col 8 lines 45-51] with a spell-checking program which dynamically checking [Gross col 9 lines 45-50] when the message error [Gross, col 2 lines 5-22]

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the automatically spelling check program as taught



Art Unit: 2616

by Gross into Progrebisky's apparatus in order to utilize the error code, scanning and prompting process.

Doing so would improve the integrity and accuracy of email message.

11. As per claim 9, Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose searching for similarly spelled domain names is performed by checking each alphanumeric character comprised in the extracted domain name with the alpha-numeric characters (i.e.: text) comprised in the domain names in the database [Gross, an email program col 8 lines 45-51; a spell-checking program which dynamically checking, col 9 lines 45-50].

12. As per claim 10, Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose searching for similarly spelled domain names is performed by removing an alpha-numeric character from the extracted domain name and searching the domain name database for a domain name consisting of at least each of the remaining alphanumeric characters in the extracted domain name [Gross, an email program col 8 lines 45-51; a spell-checking program which dynamically checking, col 9 lines 45-50].

13. As per claim 11, Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose searching for similarly spelled domain names is performed by comparing the extracted domain name with reference domain names stored in the domain name database according to predetermined spelling grammar algorithms [Gross, an email program col 8 lines 45-51; a spell-checking program which dynamically checking, col 9 lines 45-50].

14. As per claims 12,13 Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose the error prompt is an e-mail message from the e-mail server to the client computer transmitting the e-mail communication [Progrebisky, web server, Fig 7].

15. As per claim 14, Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose determining whether extracted domain names are already stored in the domain name database, whereby only a single copy of an extracted domain name is stored in the domain name database as inherent feature of database.

16. As per claim 15, Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose storing tally information in the domain name database to tally the frequency in which domain names in the domain name database are extracted from incoming e-mail communications as inherent feature of domain list or database.

17. As per claim 16, Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose deleting domain names from the domain name database that are not frequently extracted from incoming e-mail communications according to respective tally information as inherent feature of domain list or database.

18. As per claim 17, Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose the tally information for each domain name in the domain name database includes the calendar date in which the

Art Unit: 2616

domain name was most recently extracted as inherent feature of domain list or database.

19. As per claim 18 Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose An e-mail server for automatically checking for misspelled e-mail addresses in outgoing e-mail communications prior to transmission by an e-mail communications server, comprising:

an interceptor (i.e.: filter) for extracting domain names from e-mail addresses provided in incoming and outgoing e-mail communications [Progrebisky, filter bar, col 16 lines 8-26];

a database generator for generating a domain name database for storing domain names extracted from sender's e-mail addresses in incoming e-mail communications [Progrebisky, database search for domain or URLs, col 25 lines 30-45]; and

a checker for searching the domain name database for domain names spelled similarly to the domain names in e-mail addresses associated with intended recipients of in the outgoing e-mail communications, wherein the e-mail server prompts the user when it detects misspelled domain names in e-mail addresses in outgoing e-mail communications [Gross, an email program col 8 lines 45-51; a spell-checking program which dynamically checking, col 9 lines 45-50].

20. As per claim 19 Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose an internal network communications interface for receiving outgoing e-mail communications to be transmitted from client computers and sending incoming e-mail communications to

Art Unit: 2616

client computers, wherein the prompt is transmitted from the internal network communications interface to the client computer requesting transmission of the corresponding outgoing e-mail communication [Progrebisky, scanning URLs address. Otherwise the user is prompted to manually enter the URL, col 20 lines 34-41; verify or confirm external links, col 21 lines 18-24].

21. As per claim 20 Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose an external network communications interface for receiving incoming e-mail communications from an external network and sending outgoing e-mail communications transmitted from client computer connected to the internal network, wherein outgoing e-mail communications are transmitted from the external network communications interface to the external network after the checker confirms e-mail address spelling in the outgoing e-mail communications [Progrebisky, scanning URLs address. Otherwise the user is prompted to manually enter the URL, col 20 lines 34-41; verify or confirm external links, col 21 lines 18-24].

22. As per claim 26, Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose an e-mail communications system stored in a client computer for automatically checking for incorrect e-mail addresses provided in outgoing e-mail communications from the client computer prior to transmission to an e-mail server, comprising:

an address extractor for extracting senders' e-mail addresses from incoming e-mail communications [Progrebisky, filter bar, col 16 lines 8-26];

a previous sender addresses memory for storing e-mail addresses extracted from senders' e-mail addresses in incoming e-mail communications [Progrebisky, database search for domain or URLs, col 25 lines 30-45]; and

a checker for searching the previous sender addresses memory for e-mail addresses of intended recipients of the that are provided in outgoing e-mail communications , wherein the checker generates a prompt for verification of an email address of an intended recipient upon detecting that an e-mail address of an intended recipient in an outgoing e-mail communication is not present in the previous sender addresses memory [Progrebisky, scanning URLs address. Otherwise the user is prompted to manually enter the URL, col 20 lines 34-41; verify or confirm external links, col 21 lines 18-24].

23. As per claim 27, Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose the previous sender addresses memory is included in an e-mail address directory [Progrebisky, database search for domain or URLs, col 25 lines 30-45].

24. As per claim 28, Progrebisky-Ortega-Gross disclose the e-mail address directory additionally stores user-specified e-mail addresses [Progrebisky, database search for domain or URLs, col 25 lines 30-45].

Art Unit: 2616

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thong H. Vu whose telephone number is 571-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on 571-272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**Thong Vu**  
**Primary Examiner**



**THONG VU**  
**PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER**